

REMARKS

Claim 12 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 14, and 16 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-14, and 16-22 are pending.

Claims 1, 14, and 16 have been amended in a manner believed to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112. Specifically, the claims have been amended to recite a “properly authenticated pattern of connection requests, probes, or scans,” which finds support in the same terms as recited on page 13, lines 20-21.

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-14, and 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalajan in view of Teraoka. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 1, 14, and 16, each has been amended to recite that authentication is based on a determination that an observed “behavioral pattern of packets matches a properly authenticated pattern of connection requests, probes, or scans.” Such a pattern is equivalent to a secret sequence of knocks on the door, which a remote address makes by sending connection requests, probes, or scans in a specified sequence known only to authorized users of the recited port. As described in page 2 of the Office Action, Kalajan discloses using password systems to validate communication packets and Teraoka teaches use of a “source-host authenticator” within a packet header that contains a “predetermined secret key” used for authentication purposes. However, neither a conventional password nor a “predetermined secret key” as described by Kalajan or Teraoka, respectively, is the same as a “properly authenticated pattern of connection requests, probes, or scans”. As such, claims 1, 14, and 16 are believed to be allowable. In addition, neither Kalajan nor Teraoka appears to describe enabling access by “allowing the remote address to establish, through a connection request received during the configurable period of time, a connection with the host via a port with which the request is associated and closing the port after expiration of the configurable period of time,” as recited in claims 1, 14, and 16 as amended. For this additional reason, claims 1, 14, and 16 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-7, 9-11, and 13 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. Likewise, claims 17-22 depend from claim 14 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-20-08



William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014